

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing and re-examination and reconsideration of the subject application, as amended, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. §1.112, and in light of the remarks which follow, are respectfully requested.

Because the above amendments are believed to place the application in condition for allowance or, at the very least, reduce the number of issues for consideration on appeal, entry of the same is believed to be fully consistent with 37 C.F.R. §1.116. Furthermore, it is noted that during the interview, the Examiner agreed to entry of such amendments.

The Examiner, Ms. Johnson, is thanked for the courtesy of the interview conducted with the undersigned attorney on May 10, 2000.

During the interview, applicants presented proposed amendments to Claims 36-38 as well as new Claims 71-72. The Examiner agreed during the interview that the proposed claims for the most part overcome all of the outstanding issues raised in the Official Action. The Examiner did suggest several changes, however, which will now be discussed.

First, the Examiner expressed concern over the use in Claims 36 and 72 of the trademark Sephacryl S300 ®. The Examiner asked the undersigned to ascertain whether a more generic description of such trademark was available. In response, the undersigned notes that the trademark is used to designate a across-linked allyl dextran, as is set forth in U.S. Patent No. 4,330,440, at page 8 (copy attached).

The Examiner further advised the undersigned to replace the recited "repeat sequences of Table 3" with the sequences actually set forth in that table. To this end, applicant have amended Claim 38 and redrafted proposed Claim 71 to recited SEQ ID NOS: 6-10 rather than the "sequences of Table 3."

Finally, the Examiner inquired during the interview whether salt concentrations should be set forth as part of the stringency conditions recited

in Claim 38. In this regard, the Examiner suggested that applicants review the specification to see if such a salt concentration is set forth. In response, applicants refer the Examiner to page 6 of the originally filed application and, more particularly, to lines 4-12 which does not require any particular salt when carrying out the hybridization at 65 °C in an aqueous solution.

Accordingly, no such salt has been further recited in Claim 38.

In view of the above, it is submitted that all outstanding issues have now been resolved.

In the event that there are any questions relating to this Amendment After Final Rejection or to the application in general, it would be appreciated if the Examiner would contact the undersigned attorney concerning such questions so that prosecution of this application can be expedited.

In view of the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order, and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. Schulman
Registration No. 31,196

NIXON PEABODY LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 800
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 790-9110
(703) 883-0370 (Fax)